



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/815,816	04/02/2004	Jeffrey A. Alvey	010564/00030	9335

25223 7590 04/04/2006

WHITEFORD, TAYLOR & PRESTON, LLP  
ATTN: GREGORY M STONE  
SEVEN SAINT PAUL STREET  
BALTIMORE, MD 21202-1626

EXAMINER
----------

LEWIS, AARON J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3743

DATE MAILED: 04/04/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/815,816

Applicant(s)

ALVEY, JEFFREY A.

Examiner

AARON J. LEWIS

Art Unit

3743

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12/15/2005 (AMENDMENT).
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 and 10-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 and 10-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>8/25/05; 8/24/05</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Double Patenting*

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

2. Claims 1-6,10-14 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-6,8-24 of copending Application No. 10/393,346. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the difference between claim 1 of the instant application and claim 1 of application ('346) lies in the fact that claim 1 of the ('346) application more elements and is thus more specific (e.g. claim 1 of application ('346) recites the following additional elements: "electrically powered means adapted to move said ambient air"; separately recited first second and third conduits; sensor means and means operatively associated with said sensor means adapted to generate a signal that is adapted to advise a user whether said gas emerging from said filter system has insufficient oxygen to be safely breathable; and means to, in response to said signal, open and/or close said at least one valve). Thus the invention of claim 1

Art Unit: 3743

of the ('346) application is in effect a "species" of the "generic" invention of claim 1 of the instant invention. It has been held that the generic invention is "anticipated" by the "species". See *In re Goodman*, 29USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Since claim 1 of the instant application is anticipated by claim 1 of application ('346), it is not patentably distinct from claim 1 of application ('346).

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

3. Claims 1-6,10-14 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1,3-19 of copending Application No. 10/933,555. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the difference between claim 1 of the instant application and claim 1 of application ('555) lies in the fact that claim 1 of the ('555) application more elements and is thus more specific (e.g. claim 1 of application ('555) recites the following additional elements: a sensor adapted to determine whether air emerging from said filter system is safely breathable and a signal generator operatively associated with said sensor, adapted to generate a signal indicative of whether said air emerging from said filter system is safely breathable; and a controller to open and/or close said valve in response to said signal). Thus the invention of claim 1 of the ('555) application is in effect a "species" of the "generic" invention of claim 1 of the instant invention. It has been held that the generic invention is "anticipated" by the "species". See *In re Goodman*, 29USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Since claim 1 of the instant application is anticipated by claim 1 of application ('555), it is not patentably distinct from claim 1 of application ('555).

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

4. Claims 1-6,10-14 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-4,6-16 of copending Application No. 10/675,135. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the difference between claim 1 of the instant application and claim 1 of application ('135) lies in the fact that claim 1 of the ('135) application more elements and is thus more specific (e.g. claim 1 of application ('135) recites the following additional elements: a switch associated with the means to move and coupled to the valve assembly adapted to control energization of the moving means in conjunction with operation of the valve assembly). Thus the invention of claim 1 of the ('135) application is in effect a "species" of the "generic" invention of claim 1 of the instant invention. It has been held that the generic invention is "anticipated" by the "species". See *In re Goodman*, 29USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Since claim 1 of the instant application is anticipated by claim 1 of application ('135), it is not patentably distinct from claim 1 of application ('135).

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

Art Unit: 3743

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-6,10,11,13,14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mucha (DE 195 03 027 A1) in view of Hilton et al. (EP 0 241 188 A1) and Freidank et al.('970).

As to claim 1, Mucha discloses a breathing apparatus comprising: a tank (9) adapted to contain air under pressure; a filter system (7) adapted to enable ambient air to pass through a filter medium having a mesh that is sufficient to trap solid particles in ambient air and/or to enable ambient air in need of cleaning to have a residence time in contact with media that is sufficient to decontaminate contaminating vapors and gases from said ambient air to form clean air; means (8,8') adapted to move said ambient air into said filter system, through said filter medium in said filter system and thence into operative relationship with a user of the apparatus; a valve assembly (4) operatively associated with said filter system and said tank that is adapted to control the flow of cleaned air from said filter system and air from said pressure tank, conduit means (5,2) disposed between, and in operative association with, said means to move said ambient air and means (1) directly associated with the user of said apparatus through which air is provided to a user of said apparatus; and control means (12) associated with said valve assembly and adapted to control said means to move ambient air into and through said

filter system (see abstract and note electrical connections between control means 12 and fans 8,8' in fig.1).

The differences between Mucha and claim 1 are regulator means operatively associated with the tank of pressurized air to enable delivery of said pressurized air to a user of said apparatus and an intended result of a user being capable of determining whether to breathe cleaned air or pressurized air by virtue of the operation of the control means.

Hilton et al., in a breathing apparatus, teach a regulator means (34) to enable delivery of said pressurized gas to a user of said apparatus. The purpose of regulator means (34) of Hilton et al. is to reduce the pressure of the breathable gas leaving pressurized tank (33) so that it may be delivered to a user at a safe pressure.

It would have been obvious to modify the pressurized tank of Mucha to employ a regulator means because it would have reduced the pressure of the breathable gas leaving pressurized tank so that it may be delivered to a user at a safe pressure as taught by Hilton et al..

Freidank et al., in a breathing apparatus, teach means (16,17) adapted to generate a signal that is adapted to advise a wearer whether the gas emerging from said filter system (20) has insufficient oxygen to be safely breathable for the purpose of advising a wearer that the filter system is in need of replacement.

It would have been obvious to modify the controller of Mucha to include a signal to a wearer regarding the status of the filter system because it would have advised the wearer that the filter system is in need of replacement as taught by Freidank et al..

Art Unit: 3743

As to claim 2, Hilton et al. (fig.7) teach plural filter/decontamination elements (9).

As to claim 3, Hilton et al. (figs.4-6,8,9) teach a mask adapted to establish and maintain a seal with the face of a user so as to isolate at least the nose and mouth of said user from ambient air, and adapted to maintain a seal under conditions of positive pressure within the mask (note separate valves for exhalation and inhalation).

As to claim 4, Mucha (fig.1) discloses a first conduit (6) between said tank (9) and said mask (1), said second conduit means (5) between said filter system (7) and said mask (1), and said at least one valve (4) operatively associated with said conduit means adapted to control the flow of cleaned air from said filter system or air from said tank to said user.

As to claim 5, Hilton et al. (figs.2,4,6) teach a plenum chamber (21) operatively associated with said tank (33) and said filter system (9) such that cleaned air from said filter system and from said tank, respectively, are adapted to respectively flow into said plenum chamber and conduit means (2) disposed between said plenum chamber and said face mask.

As to claim 6, Hilton et al. teach a one-way exhaust valve (4) operatively associated with the mask.

As to claim 10, Mucha (see abstract) discloses said control means (12) controls said moving means (8,8') in conjunction with operation of said valve assembly (4).

As to claim 11, the control means of Mucha (see abstract) operates in an automatic manner responsive to signals from sensors 10 and 11 to actuate valve assembly (4) in dependence upon the sensed signals.



As to claim 13, while Mucha discloses a single gas cylinder (9), it would have been obvious to modify the compressed gas supply by duplicating the gas cylinder as an obvious matter of design choice because it would have provided additional breathable gas to enable a wearer to use the device for a longer period of time without the need for replacement of the cylinder or breathing device.

As to claim 14, Mucha (see abstract) discloses elements (8,8') as being fans and control means (12) controlling the operation of the fans via electrical conductors (fig.1). Official notice is taken that the driving force for electrically operated fans typically consists of an electric motor.

7. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mucha (DE 195 03 027 A1) in view of Hilton et al. (EP 0 241 188 A1) and Freidank et al.('970) as applied to claims 1-6,10,11,13,14 above, and further in view of Hubner ('518).

The difference between Mucha as modified by Hilton et al. and Freidank et al. and claim 12 is means adapted to determine if the composition of gas emerging from said filter system comprises a sufficiently small amount of particulate matter to be safely breathable.

Hubner teaches analyzing (via sensor 7, 7a-7e) an ambient atmosphere to determine if it is not breathable and notifying the user if the ambient atmosphere is not breathable for the purpose of preventing a user from breathing toxic gases by notifying the user that the filtering capacity of the filter medium is failing as well as preventing the accumulation of potentially explosive gases.

It would have been obvious to modify the breathing apparatus of Mucha to include an analysis of ambient gas to determine if the ambient gas is breathable because it would have prevented a user from breathing toxic gases by notifying the user that the filtering capacity of the filter medium is failing as well as preventing the accumulation of potentially explosive gases as taught by Hubner.

***Response to Arguments***

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-6,10-14 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to AARON J. LEWIS whose telephone number is (571) 272-4795. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30AM-6:00PM M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, HENRY A. BENNETT can be reached on (571) 272-4791. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Application/Control Number: 10/815,816

Page 10

Art Unit: 3743

  
AARON J. LEWIS  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 3743

Aaron J. Lewis  
April 02, 2006